

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANGELA BLACKWELL,

Petitioner,

Civil No. 2:14-CV-11718
Honorable Gershwin A. Drain

v.

MILlicENT WARREN,

Respondent,

/

**OPINION AND ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS AND DECLINING TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF
APPEALABILITY**

Angela Blackwell, (“Petitioner”), confined at the Huron Valley Women’s Correctional Facility in Ypsilanti, Michigan, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 with this Court on or about April 29, 2014. On May 8, 2014, Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen signed an “Order to Correct Deficiency,” in which Ms. Blackwell was ordered to submit a \$ 5.00 fee for filing a habeas corpus petition or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within twenty one days of the order. For the reasons stated below, Ms. Blackwell’s action is dismissed without prejudice because of her failure to comply with an order of the court.

I. Discussion

Ms. Blackwell’s application is subject to dismissal, because she failed to comply with the order of deficiency by either submitting the \$5.00 filing fee or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

If a prisoner who seeks habeas corpus relief does not comply with a district court’s

directions in a deficiency order, regarding the prisoner's failure to pay the full filing fee and his or her failure to provide the required documentation to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the district court must presume that the prisoner is not a pauper, assess the full filing fee, and dismiss the case for want of prosecution. See *Gravitt v. Tyszkiewicz*, 14 Fed. Appx. 348, 349 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F. 3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997)). The deficiency order clearly stated that Ms. Blackwell was required to submit either the \$ 5.00 filing fee or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The deficiency order also expressly warned petitioner that failure to comply with the order could result in the dismissal of her action. Because Ms. Blackwell failed to pay the filing fee or submit the required application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, her petition is subject to dismissal for want of prosecution. *Gravitt*, 14 Fed. Appx. at 349.

The Court will summarily dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus without prejudice. The Court will also deny a certificate of appealability. In order to obtain a certificate of appealability, a prisoner must make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claims, a certificate of appealability should issue, and an appeal of the district court's order may be taken, if the petitioner shows that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). "The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rule 11(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

The Court will deny Ms. Blackwell a certificate of appealability, because the dismissal of the petition based on petitioner's failure to cure her filing deficiencies would not be debatable amongst jurists of reason. See *Soeken v. Estep*, 270 Fed. Appx. 734, 735-36 (10th Cir. 2008).

II. ORDER

Based upon the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Nothing in this order precludes petitioner from submitting a new habeas petition with payment of the filing fee or the *in forma pauperis* application.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 20, 2014

/s/ Gershwin A. Drain
GERSHWIN A. DRAIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on June 20, 2014, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

/s/ Tanya Bankston
Deputy Clerk